

Sutton	Van Hollen	Wexler
Tanner	Velázquez	Wilson (OH)
Tauscher	Visclosky	Wolf
Taylor	Walz (MN)	Woolsey
Terry	Waters	Wu
Thompson (CA)	Watson	Wynn
Thompson (MS)	Watt	Yarmuth
Tierney	Waxman	Young (FL)
Towns	Weiner	
Udall (NM)	Welch (VT)	

## NOES—153

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Akin	Gerlach	Pearce
Alexander	Gohmert	Pence
Bachmann	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Goodlatte	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Granger	Pitts
Bartlett (MD)	Graves	Platts
Barton (TX)	Hall (TX)	Poe
Biggart	Hastert	Porter
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Heller	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hensarling	Putnam
Blunt	Herger	Radanovich
Boehner	Hoekstra	Regula
Bono	Hulshof	Reichert
Boozman	Inglis (SC)	Renzi
Boustany	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	King (NY)	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Kingston	Royce
Camp (MI)	Kirk	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Kline (MN)	Saxton
Capito	Kuhl (NY)	Schmidt
Carter	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Coble	LaTourette	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Crenshaw	Linder	Shimkus
Cubin	LoBiondo	Shuster
Culberson	Lucas	Simpson
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Deal (GA)	E.	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Mack	Souder
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Stearns
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Drake	McCotter	Thornberry
Dreier	McHenry	Tiahrt
Duncan	McHugh	Tiberi
Emerson	McKeon	Upton
English (PA)	McMorris	Walberg
Fallin	Rodgers	Walden (OR)
Feeney	Mica	Walsh (NY)
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Weller
Fox	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Gallely	Myrick	

## NOT VOTING—49

Allen	Doyle	Miller, George
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Nunes
Boucher	Forbes	Paul
Braley (IA)	Fortuño	Pickering
Buyer	Gingrey	Reyes
Calvert	Harman	Reynolds
Cannon	Hayes	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Hinchey	Smith (TX)
Cardoza	Hunter	Tancredo
Clarke	Johnson, Sam	Turner
Cummings	Keller	Udall (CO)
Davis (KY)	Knollenberg	Wasserman
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Schultz
Davis, Tom	Lamborn	Whitfield
DeFazio	Marchant	Wicker
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCaul (TX)	Young (AK)
Dicks	McCrery	

## □ 1928

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. PEARCE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during today's vote on H.R. 2831, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007, which will protect women against pay

discrimination and restore all employee's rights regarding nondiscriminatory pay. The legislation will reverse the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear* by putting into statute widely accepted rules in employment discrimination law. I strongly support federal protections against pay discrimination; therefore, had I been present, I would have voted for H.R. 2831.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute for the purposes of informing the Members of the schedule for the week to come, for today and for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized. There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, obviously, the American public sent us here to get its work done. Obviously as well, we have differences on what work we ought to be doing and what the substance of that work ought to be, and they expect us to debate that, and they expect us to have our differences, and then they expect us to resolve those differences through voting and moving legislation.

The Agriculture appropriation bill is on the floor. Mr. OBEY, myself, and Mr. BOEHNER had very long discussions about how we would consider the appropriation bills. On or about June 14, it was June 12 and 13 that we really discussed, we came to agreement. We came to agreement on how we would consider the appropriation bills, essentially the time frame that would be accorded to those bills, that we would have open rules on the appropriation bills, and that we would come to only unanimous consent agreements on the constraint of debate.

## □ 1930

Furthermore, we agreed that we would offer a rule the Monday following June 14 to provide for a point of order on items added to appropriation bills.

I believe that I have, as leader, done everything I said I would do.

On Monday, I offered a unanimous consent, a request to add to our rules the point of order that the minority felt important to protect its rights. That unanimous consent, obviously, was not objected to. It is now part of our rules.

Since that time, on 10 appropriation bills we have had open rules, as we said we would. The agreement, as you have heard me state before, contemplated that you would give us, on the minority side, essentially the same unanimous consents that we gave to you in an election year 1 year ago.

Notwithstanding that understanding, we have taken 50 hours longer to consider the appropriation bills since that time than we took last year when you were in charge and Mr. OBEY gave the unanimous consent. You've heard me complain about that because I thought that was not consistent with the agreement.

Notwithstanding that, we have proceeded on this floor with open rules, and the Agriculture appropriation bill has come to the floor with an open rule. The Agriculture appropriation bill has been on the floor for some, 4, 4½ hours, and we are not really considering the substance of the Agriculture appropriation bill.

I know there is upset on your side of the aisle, I say to my friends on the minority side, about another bill. But there was nothing in the agreement that said if you were upset with another bill that the agreement reached between Mr. BOEHNER and I and Mr. OBEY would not be honored. There was nothing that said that if we're angry about another bill that we will disrupt the appropriations process.

And, therefore, it is my perception, and I think, based upon the facts that everyone in this country has observed over the last number of hours, that my perception is the agreement has not been honored. I regret that.

I will tell you that I pride myself on honoring my agreements, even when it may anger my side of the aisle, because I believe that if we are to proceed in a civil way, in a way that we can trust one another, that is what we ought to do. Notwithstanding the extra 50 hours that we've spent, we were prepared to proceed.

Now, let me read just briefly, Mr. SHADEGG was on the floor just a little while ago and spoke. This is what Mr. SHADEGG said on the 14th:

“As I understand it, this”, meaning our agreement to move bills forward, “is an attempt to make sure that we don't waste time on dilatory tactics; that, rather, we proceed through these bills in an orderly fashion, but if someone has a substantive objection that should be accommodated. Is that correct?” Mr. SHADEGG asked me.

In response, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee stated, and I quote Mr. OBEY: “It is our hope that you will respond as we did in the minority by agreeing to reasonable time limits on each of those bills in return for that.” In return for that was giving reasonable time for substantive amendments.

Again, my friends on the minority side, you have had 50 additional hours above and beyond the time that we debated the bills last year when you were in charge.